

**APPROVED** Minutes of the **REGULAR MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD** held on Tuesday, July 17, 2012, in the Public Meeting Room of the Village Hall, One Olde Half Day Road, Lincolnshire, IL.

**PRESENT:** Substitute Chairman Hardnock, Members Gulatee, Kennerley, Wang, and Alternate Member Schlecht.

**ABSENT:** Chairman Pro Tem Grover and Trustee Liaison McDonough.

**ALSO PRESENT:** Stephen Robles, Planner.

**CALL TO ORDER:** **Substitute Chairman Hardnock** called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

### **1.0 ROLL CALL**

The roll was called by **Planner Robles** and **Substitute Chairman Hardnock** declared a quorum to be present.

### **2.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

2.1 Approval of the Minutes of the Regular Architectural Review Board Meeting held Tuesday, June 19, 2012.

**Alternate Member Schlecht** moved and **Member Kennerley** seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the regular Meeting of the Architectural Review Board held Tuesday, June 19, 2012. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

### **3.0 ITEMS OF GENERAL BUSINESS:**

3.1 **Public Hearing** regarding variations to Section 12-9-1-B, *Wall Signs*, to increase the height of the sign face to 4'-4", rather than the code permitted 3' maximum sign face height, for three wall signs associated with Sysmex America Inc., for the property located at 577 Atpakisic Road (The Holland Design Group).

**Planner Robles** summarized Staff's memorandum dated July 13, 2012 and noted that Sysmex America, Inc. is the new occupant of the recently constructed office building at 577 Aptakisic and that will serve as the location of their North American headquarters. Sysmex is proposing to install 3 wall signs; on the south, east, and west building façades, for site identification. The signs would be installed on the top portion of the four story building, at the locations shown in the provided Presentation Packet. Based on the proportions of the corporate sign copy and bowtie logo, the wall sign height for all 3 signs was sought to be increased to 4'-4", rather than the 3' maximum. **Planner Robles** continued that Staff believed the increase in wall sign height was acceptable given that the installation location would be at the top of the fourth floor, approximately 59'-6" above grade, such would not appear to be in excess of the Sign Code at ground level. Additionally, given the mass of the office building, compliant wall signage would appear out-of-scale and too small in relation to the building's size. Lastly, **Planner Robles** noted that in the packet was the Petitioner's response to the Standards for the sign variation to be considered by the Architectural Review Board. The Petitioner requested that the responses to these standards be entered into the public record.

**Mr. Tom Holland**, The Holland Design Group, representing Sysmex America, presented the variance request and noted that the proposal had been reduced from an initial four wall signs down to three signs. The placement of the wall signs is at the top of the building corners to provide a compatible look with the building. The signs themselves have been scaled proportionally with the architectural plans to fit within the building and wall area.

**Member Kennerly** sought clarification that the total size of the sign was measured from the top of the logo to the bottom of the letters. **Mr. Holland** confirmed that was correct.

**Member Schlect** commented that he was in favor of the wall signs and felt the proportions were good and that the text would be very legible. **Member Hardnock** sought clarification that the offset logo was the true logo of Sysmex as shown. **Mr. Holland** noted that the standards have been confirmed with Sysmex in regards to design and color. **Member Schlect** questioned if the logo was a registered logo, to which **Mr. Holland** confirmed.

**Member Gulatee** noted the size of the sign being 1'-10", at 60' in height, and if studies had been done to ensure that the signs would be legible at that distance. **Mr. Holland** confirmed such and **Member Gulatee** noted his support.

**Member Schlect** questioned if there was only one tenant for the building, to which **Mr. Holland** confirmed. **Planner Robles** noted that in addition to the wall signs, a sign permit for the construction of a ground sign had been submitted and was in the review process. **Member Gulatee** sought clarification on the sign code requirements for single tenants and the number of wall signs permitted. **Planner Robles** explained that the sign code permits a total of four signs on each building façade, due to two street frontages and the other building façades facing a parking lot.

There being no further public comment, **Substitute Chairman Hardnock** closed the public hearing and reconvened the ARB meeting.

- 3.2 Consideration and discussion regarding variations to Section 12-9-1-B, *Wall Signs*, to increase the height of the sign face to 4'-4", rather than the code permitted 3' maximum sign face height, for three wall signs associated with Sysmex America Inc., for the property located at 577 Atpakisic Road (The Holland Design Group).

*Mr. Schlecht moved and Mr. Gulatee seconded a motion to approve, and recommend to the Village Board for their approval of wall sign plans associated with Sysmex America Inc., with a variation to Section 12-9-1-B, Wall Signs, to increase the height of the sign face to 4'-4", rather than the code permitted 3' maximum sign face height, as presented in a presentation packet submitted by The Holland Design Group, dated stamp received July 2, 2012, for the property commonly addressed as 577 Aptakisic Road, as presented in Staff's memorandum dated July 13, 2012.*

*The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.*

- 3.3 **Public Hearing** regarding a variation to Section 12-9-1-B-10, *Wall Signs*, to permit internally illuminated wall signs, rather than the code required backlit/halo illumination, for three wall signs associated with Sysmex America Inc, for the property located at 577 Aptakisic Road (The Holland Design Group).

**Planner Robles** summarized Staff's memorandum and noted that in addition, Sysmex requested that each wall sign be internally illuminated, where light would be directed through the face of each letter and logo. This was a departure from the code required backlit illumination, where light is directed from the back of the letters and creates a halo effect that has been a long running standard in the Village. He continued that while there were internally illuminated wall signs in the Village, such were solely limited to commercial Planned Unit Developments through former Areas of Special Sign Control such as is present at CityPark and Lincolnshire Commons. While Staff understood the desire to illuminate the wall signs; a practical difficulty could not be determined that would prevent illumination in compliance with the Sign Control. As a result, Staff recommended that code-compliant backlit illumination be used for any wall sign illumination. **Planner Robles** concluded that within the packet was the Petitioner's response to the Standards for both sign variations to be considered by the ARB. The Petitioner requested that the responses to these standards be entered into the public record.

**Tom Holland**, The Holland Design Group, explained that many alternatives in sign location were explored and once the location was selected, it was determined that halo lighting would not work on the dark background of the building since the light would be absorbed by the dark color. The best color that reflects white light, is a white background, which would defeat the purpose of the Sysmex logo and proposed that the signs be internally illuminated. After looking at various options, it was believed the signs would look very complimentary to the building. As Sysmex is utilizing the large building, the goal is to ensure that everyone sees the building and people know where Sysmex is located. **Ed Drapatsky**, Corporate Purchasing Real Estate Manager with Sysmex America, added that Sysmex has been part of the Lake County business community for the past 15 years. The decision to move to Lincolnshire had been a 3-year process and the main driver of that decision was an assurance that the corporate identity was maintained. Sysmex is a global company where corporate identity standards are critical and consistency among all buildings is consistent worldwide. **Mr. Drapatsky** further clarified it was critical that Sysmex be able to stay within their corporate guidelines to achieve consistency. The variance was being requested in order for Sysmex to be consistent with all their other buildings in the U.S., as well as globally.

**Member Gulatee** questioned where else Sysmex's building were located in the U.S. **Mr. Drapatsky** responded that Sysmex has locations in Mundelein, an office building in Canada and other offices worldwide.

**Member Kennerly** questioned if there were any samples available or any pictures of how the other corporate buildings look. **Mr. Drapatsky** noted that the corporate guidelines were included in their presentation packet and that photographs of the corporate building in Japan and other locations could be provided, but were not available at the meeting. **Member Kennerly** further asked if there were any additional images that showed what the sign (lighting) would look like according to

Village Code and what the sign would look like according to the corporate standard as it was important for the ARB to see what the sign would look like and how different it would be compared to the other businesses in the community. **Mr. Holland** explained that the sign would be constructed out of the same materials as other typical wall signs and the opaque vinyl used on the face would allow the light to shine through, but would not be overpowering and will look just like the logo itself does in the packet. **Member Kennerly** commented that if the ARB were to consider the variance, she needs to be able to see what the sign would look like. **Planner Robles** sought clarification regarding **Member Kennerly's** comment that a night rendering of what the wall signs would look like when illuminated is what was being requested. **Member Kennerly** confirmed the same. **Mr. Holland** elaborated on the proposed construction of the wall signs and the type of L.E.D. lighting to be used. **Member Gulatee** suggested that photographs of other Sysmex signage used in Mundelein or elsewhere in the country could be brought to show the ARB.

**Member Schlecht** sought clarification on how the signs were studied based on the applicant's presentation that studies had been conducted. **Mr. Holland** explained that meetings were held with interior builders and their architects with Takanaka Corporation, and had a number of meetings where many layouts were discussed and the current proposal was the outcome. **Member Schelecht** questioned that when the signage was tested, if it was actually tested on the side of the building to review. **Mr. Holland** stated that they were unable to do such at that time, but had done so within the computer. **Mr. Schlecht** commented that there are a lot of corporations with international corporate standards that move to Lincolnshire, but still comply (with sign regulations). He asked why would Sysmex ask for a variance? Was there a color issue? Or something else to ask for the variance? He continued, there's a Walgreen's in the Village and they comply even though they would probably prefer to have internally lit letters. **Member Schlecht** expressed his uncertainty that there was a compelling argument as to why the ARB should allow the change and expressed his wonder of what it would look like, what the corporate standard sought and what the code requires. **Mr. Drapatsky** offered that a night rendering could be provided but further elaborated that the color saturation would look very different from what the corporate guidelines required. **Member Schlecht** commented that may be such, but there was nothing provided to the ARB to show that was the case.

**Member Hardnock** questioned whether a ground sign was also going to be provided at the site. **Planner Robles** confirmed and provided a brief summary of the ground sign dimensions and design characteristics. **Member Hardnock** elaborated that based on the neighboring United Auto Workers Union building to the east and the existing trees, that the first sign a passing motorists would see would be the Sysmex ground sign. He also felt the same was true for motorists coming from the west. **Member Hardnock** further questioned the need for the illumination of the wall sign and if Sysmex would have employees accessing the site at night. He continued, expressing why would the ARB approve the variance request against the established code since there was significant time spent on the revisions to the new Sign Code? Based on the information provided, he could not find a rationale to approve the request, not just because of the lack of illustration on how the sign would look illuminated at night. **Mr. Drapatsky** emphasized the

importance of the corporate identity and the key point to Sysmex signing the lease was their ability to “sign” the façades to Sysmex’s corporate standards. In fact, a lease was also signed across Aptakisic Road in Buffalo Grove where there would also be Sysmex signage. The idea was to create a type of corporate park so that when a potential customer, employee or Sysmex VIP approached the area, they would see Sysmex signage on the south side of the street in Buffalo Grove, as well as to the north in Lincolnshire. The whole concept was to showcase their presence, not only in Lincolnshire, but also in Buffalo Grove. **Member Hardnock** questioned if this was discussed with the Village Staff. **Mr. Draptasky** commented that there were some conversations with Staff, but prior to finalizing the lease there was no discussion.

**Member Schlecht** sought clarification on **Mr. Holland’s** presentation where it was presented that the background (building) color was too light and if it were darker that it would reflect more light. **Mr. Holland** clarified that the building color was too dark and absorbed more light, which was the problem. If a lighter colored panel were placed behind the sign, the light would reflect and be seen. **Member Schlecht** then questioned that if the building were a lighter color, would the wall signs then be able to comply with the code. **Mr. Holland** responded that it was Sysmex’s preference to stay within the standards of Sysmex and keep the internal illumination and color representation of their logo. **Member Schlecht** noted that he had not heard anything compelling to support the variance other than they wanted to (have internal illumination). **Mr. Holland** replied that Sysmex has compromised on the size of wall sign and reduced the number of signs after exploring many different options based on how they wanted to represent the building. Every other Sysmex building has the corporate colors, and is even brighter in Japan, and they wanted to stay within their corporate logo scheme. **Member Schlecht** responded that the same held true for Walgreens and every other company; they all want their corporate color schemes. **Mr. Draptasky** questioned what the ARB would consider a compelling argument. **Member Schlecht** responded that the ARB wanted to know the reason why Sysmex was so much different from a Walgreens, as an example, or any other corporate industry, and then they could recommend a variance.

**Member Hardnock** questioned if external illumination was permitted by code. **Planner Robles** confirmed that wall signs could be externally illuminated, such as by goose neck lighting fixtures. **Member Hardnock** commented that with high intensity L.E.D.’s available, that there might be other options to light the signs. He acknowledge that external illumination might not have been Sysmex’s first choice, but could have been a way to get Sysmex what they wanted and still meet the code. **Member Gulatee** added that the current proposal was to have a very crisp sign and the sign stands out. Once external lighting is added, control is lost in directing light and the result would not be known. The request included very controlled lighting. **Member Wang** proposed that the Petitioner provide photos of various times throughout the day showing the effects that the change in lighting would have on the proposed signs.

Additional discussion ensued regarding what options were available to the ARB and the best method to proceed with the proposed request and Sysmex’s timeline.

There being no further public comment, **Substitute Chairman Hardnock** closed the public hearing and reconvened the ARB meeting.

- 3.4 Consideration and discussion regarding a variation to Section 12-9-1-B-10, *Wall Signs*, to permit internally illuminated wall signs, rather than the code required backlit/halo illumination, for three wall signs associated with Sysmex America Inc, for the property located at 577 Aptakisic Road (The Holland Design Group).

*The Architectural Review Board voted unanimously to continue consideration and discussion of this matter until the August 21, 2012 ARB meeting, at the Petitioner's request, to allow them the opportunity to provide additional information and address other items requested by the ARB.*

**4.0 UNFINISHED BUSINESS (None)**

**5.0 NEW BUSINESS (None)**

**6.0 CITIZENS COMMENTS (None)**

**7.0 ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, **Alternative Chairman Hardnock** adjourned the meeting at 8:20 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Stephen Robles, Planner.